

REMARKS

This communication is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated June 16, 2005 and issued under Ex parte Quayle. Claims 1, 2 and 4 have been amended to correct informalities. No new matter has been added

I. Priority Claim

It is noted with appreciation that the Office Action has acknowledged receipt of the claim for priority and the certified document supporting that claim.

II. Objections to Claims

Claim 1

Claim 1 is objected to because of informalities. In particular, the Office Action asserts that in lines 6 and 7 the phrase “other than those of supporting points formed by the stationary type supports” lacks antecedent basis, and in line 11 the word “holds” should be hold because it refers back to the displacement type supports.”

By the foregoing amendment, the Applicant has amended claim 1 in order to overcome the objections. Therefore, withdrawal of the objections and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claim 2

Claim 2 is objected to because of informalities. In particular, the Office Action asserts that since claim 1 recites “displacement type supports, each of which supports the platen,” and dependent claim 2 recites “the platen is supported by only the stationary type supports, these two statements are contradictory.

By the foregoing amendment, Applicant has amended claim 2 so as to correct the contradiction. Support for this feature is found at least within the specification as originally filed, for example, at page 16, lines 1-7.

Claim 3

Claim 3 is objected to because of informalities. In particular, the Office Action asserts that since lines 10 and 11 state “the platen material is supported by only the stationary type supports” while line 17 recites displacement type supports “forming displacement type supporting points”, these two statements are contradictory.

As preliminary matter, claim 3 does not recite such features. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection and allowance of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4

Applicant has amended claim 4 in order to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Support for this feature is found within the specification as originally filed, for example, at page 22, line through page 23, line 18.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. UDK-0013 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Shawn B. Cage

Registration No.: 51,522

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorney for Applicant